

Exhibit 4

Open letter June 13, 2009

Portalakis to Louis Meisel



["Axia" newspaper, Saturday, June 13th 2009, page 7]

[Translator's note: in all instances, Mr. Portalakis' vocative to Mr.Meisel is in the singular 'you' ('ΕΟΥ' instead of 'ΕΟΙΣ', both rendered as 'you' in English. This is rather informal for an address through the press and, hence, under such circumstances that is, one would tend to interpret it as rather rude). To render that tone in the translated text without making it harder for the English-speaking reader, one would have to replace 'sir' for 'mister', somewhat failing in fidelity; hence, the note.]

LETTER

Zacharias Portalakis responds to Louis Meisel's letter

"Louis, I forbid you, even as of today, to even mention the name 'Stamos' without my written permission"

Mr. Pikoulas,

I have read Mr. Louis Meisel's letter in your 23/5/09 issue. As you yourself are well aware, along with those who know me, I am not accustomed to spend my time retorting to references, comments and opinions that are historically unfounded, uncorroborated and unproven such as the ones entailed in Mr.Meisel's published letter.

Yet I am doing so today and through this point of address, with my exclusive aim to support Stamos' work, his personality and his artistic value against any attempt (apparently contrived) to blemish his personality, to demean the value of his work and his artistic stature, an attempt to manipulate the public and to degrade deeds which I consider to be of deciding importance for the artist's work and reputation.

The entire text of the letter, the attempt and Mr. Meisel's references therein aroused my hilarity but also my fury.

And I say so since the pretentiously reply letter from a man I myself never addressed to, made no question to or passed judgement for his personality or his work and never alleged against him the slightest relating to him, much more so without having the relative firm evidence of proof for what I wrote in my hands (such as is the case at hand presently with the provisional judicial orders, court orders, Stamos' letter and Mr. Meisel's e-mail itself) matters necessitating rebuttal and refutation in the manner that he himself adopted.

It's hard for me to imagine and to think that Mr. Louis Meisel woke up that sunny Saturday morning of May 15th in 2009, in New York where he domiciles, dashed to the newsstand to buy the "Axia", read my letter in it and proceeded to sit down at his desk to write his controversial answer-refutation to you (instigated, as he himself allows to show through what he writes, by his disinterested desire for the restitution of the historical truth

concerning Stamos).

I speculate that, for my letter, he was initially informed and he was asked to assist -help through his mediation- people that do not have the guts, the gravity of the name and the cogency (which, even if it be supposed to have existed, it has been irredeemably scathed after these recent events) to, on the one hand, answer to all that I fully corroborated and historically correct wrote, and, to confront me, on the other. And it is for this reason they asked Mr. Meisel's help, who, though, following the above mentioned response, remains himself exposed, since he is now liable to answer to numerous questions and to justify all that he relates therein.

The only mention I made in my published letter in 'A' on May 15th, 2009, is: "Louis K. Meisel, owner of one of the largest and oldest art galleries of New York, himself an art dealer and collector, is himself in possession of 30 works by Stamos, from the 1950's up to the 1970's with prices ranging (as he himself informed me in an e-mail he sent me) from \$ 50.000 up to \$ 1.000.000!!!".

I disclosed an actual and indisputable event, which he himself claimed and the truth of which was admitted in an e-mail which I still retain in my electronic mail inbox and I stated that an art work merchant that knows about prices estimates Stamos' works in such amounts, that is to say, up to one million dollars.

Now that things have changed, and I mean the interests, this gentleman is claiming that the highest auction bid achieved is \$ 229.000, an untruthful claim, proving the lack of information or the intent to conceal the truth, but in any case aiming at vitiating Stamos' reputation.

Under no circumstances have I ever stated, and I personally do not think, that Mr. Meisel is an expert or authorized evaluator, art historian or art critic, in a way that his opinion may bear gravity and validity in the art world, all the more so I did not acknowledge in him and in his person the ability to verify the authenticity of Stamos' works and any certification for passing valid and disinterested judgement on Stamos' work.

His attempt to devaluate my own many-a-year lasting friendship with Stamos while extending his own as supposedly 40-year-old, deep and substantial, is at first strange and raises numerous questions. Such acts expose him and render him vulnerable to criticism and at the same time hold him liable for answers which he apparently does not have.

For his information, I wish to report to him that Stamos, in our endless conversations, his narratives and his mentions to Mr. Meisel, was not expressing himself in the most honourable terms, as far as both their brief and disrupted collaboration and his objectivity, his delving deep into matters, his knowledge, his understanding and his judgement on

issues relating to his work.

Besides, this is further proven by the stance of the author of your letter, Mr. Meisel himself, who, had he been a close friend of the artist and had he loved his work, he would not have written in the contentious letter all such false and defamatory things about him, or about me, either (the largest collector of his works in the world, fighting to preserve his work in its entirety) and he would have sided with me in the struggle I fight, instead of opposing me.

He would not initially write and would not claim the absolutely inaccurate and untrue, that Stamos was a difficult man in arranging his business.

Stamos was no difficult person at all, sir, he was a solid man in anything that he was after, bold in all he thought about, explicit in what he asked for and clear in his artistic views and friendships.

This is what all the people that knew him well assert, myself included as well.

If, in stating that he was “difficult in arranging his business”, you mean that he refused, as a free spirit, creative artist and universal artistic value that he was, to obey, to bend down his head and unconditionally surrender in the hands of gallery owners and art merchants who were “trying” to help him gain recognition, to let them manipulate him and direct his work, then yes, it is possible that he was, and fortunately so, difficult.

Stamos, throughout the years of our long-lasting friendship yet even by the end of his life, that I had the honour and luck to be by his side and live with him, never for one moment did he show any diminished artistic or communicative powers. He always was an unremitting and sharp mind, an incessantly moving eye, an ingenious and youthful artistic view.

He never was the artist in decadence, the old man in organic wear, the patient in desperation, whether financial or mental, as you wish to present him.

On the contrary he was self-conscious, awesome, gallant and dignified even at the end of his life.

And as regards the sum of his works, in my possession, they are the product of a legitimate, fair and just transaction with him (and Mr. Meisel’s claims to the contrary, that I supposedly procured works of his, apart from being false, they are also slanderous and calumnious for me –and I reserve myself for their disproof)

Had Mr. Meisel related to Stamos with deep and long-lasting (of forty years at that) friendship, had Stamos esteemed and trusted him, as he claims, he is liable to answer us why does his gallery has, in its history, but one single exhibition of Stamos with the

artist's consent?

Besides, it is well-known in the art market that Kouros Gallery, since 1983 and up to and including 1992 was the exclusive representative of Stamos' works for the USA, by the power of agreements contracted with the artist himself, as was, respectively, Knoedler Zurich exclusively representing Stamos' works in Europe.

These two galleries, jointly with "Friends of Stamos" negotiated and purchased Stamos' entire work prior to 1982. And the last agreement between Stamos and Kouros Gallery stipulated that the management of the sum of Stamos' works from 1985 up to 1992 would be exclusively managed by Kouros Gallery.

Then, given that Mr. Meisel was a friend of Stamos, and trying to help him make his work known and to have his artistic value recognized, as he himself declares, how was he not aware of this and how and for which reason he did not consult Kouros Gallery Archive about the contested paintings, which with so much certainty and without the slightest reservation he states that he recognizes and he considers them to be authentic?

Can he confirm that he consulted Kouros Gallery's Archives and that these contested paintings are included in Stamos' authentic paintings?

Of course not, for this issue I have myself meticulously and cautiously researched (as I always do) prior to my acting the way I did.

Thus, out of everything that absolutely arbitrarily Mr. Meisel claims, there lacks the element of evidence for the provenance of the works, that is, the proof of their authenticity, and for this reason everything he mentions is, consequently, instantly, proven unsubstantiated, unsupported and trite, and what is more, exposing, himself and their inspirer, irreparably to the art world yet at the same time expose him into legal trouble for which I repeat that I reserve myself.

The putative forgery of works with the artist's consent is also unworthy of comment and a fiction of unruly imagination, devised fabrications anticipated to justify the unjustifiable, presently and for the future.

In my entire life, I have grown tired of watching gallery owners and art merchants act according to their own benefit and altering, each time, their stance in accordance with whatever their own private gain dictates.

If you were a friend of Stamos, sir, you would admire and preserve his work. The fight you engaged into uninvited, manifests purposes: explain us what they are.

I am not, out of my own initiative and arbitrarily as you do, assuming to being an expert

in certifying Stamos' works' authenticity.

The artist, himself, with his own hand-written letter (September 1995) endorsed me as "the sole capable and responsible person to verify the authenticity of his works", something which he did not do with you, his purportedly 40-year friend, connoisseur and expert!!!

I remain, still, according to the above letter, the sole person liable "to protect, preserve and promote his work", as I mean to do forcefully, at any cost, and in and for the future.

You are on the opposite side and for this reason, Louis, I forbid you, even as of today, to even mention the name 'Stamos' without my written permission, for, otherwise, a big and unbelievable surprise is waiting for you.

Warm thanks for the reception

Zacharias Portalakis
Art Collector